

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are at issue. Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sizer, II et al. in view of Gorman.

Claim 1 requires a home security controller capable of sending and receiving a message over a wireless local loop. Sizer II et al show a system for controlling an appliance (See Abstract) and Gorman shows a wireless local loop 30, but neither reference shows a home security controller. Claim 1 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 2 requires a smart card interface capable of sending instructions to the home automation controller. The Examiner's response is to say that smart cards are well known in the art. However this is an incomplete reply, the applicants are not trying to obtain a patent on a smart card. The applicants are claiming the combination of the smart card interface in conjunction with the home automation controller and the rest of the home gateway system. The Examiner cannot ignore the connections and combinations by saying the individual elements are well known. If this line of reasoning were allowed, then the LASER would of never been allowed a patent. Since flash lamps were known, mirrors were known and ruby rods were known and in addition MASERS were known. Thus the Examiner must find a reference that shows the use of a smart card interface with a home automation controller. Claim 2 is allowable over the prior art.

The Examiner further states that the applicant has not seasonable traversed the well known statement during examination. The applicants have two responses to this statement 1) the applicants do not argue that the elements are unknown (that would be a §112 issue) but that the combination is unknown; and 2) the examiner has performed a new search

and cited completely new art after the applicants traversed the well know statement by the Examiner, thus the traversal is timely raised during the prosecution.

Claim 3 requires a voice processing system coupled to the home security system. Since no home security system is shown in the prior art cited by the Examiner, there can be no voice processing system coupled to the home security system. Claim 3 is allowable over the prior art.

Claims 4 & 5 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 3.

Claim 6 requires a switch connected to the home security system. Since no home security system is shown in the prior art cited by the Examiner, there can be no switch coupled to the home security system. Claim 6 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 7 requires a plurality of sensors connected to the home security system. Since no home security system is shown in the prior art cited by the Examiner, there can be no sensors coupled to the home security system. Claim 7 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 8 requires a speaker verification of the user by a home automation and security system. After carefully reading the prior art cited by the Examiner the applicant's cannot find any mention of speaker verification of the user. Claim 8 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 9 requires selecting the home automation and security features over an electronic connection. The prior art does not show setting the home automation and security features over an electronic connection. Claim 9 is allowable over the prior art.

Claims 10 & 11 are allowable as being dependent from the prior art.

Claim 12 requires the user speak an access code and speech recognizing the access code. After carefully reading the prior art cited by

the Examiner the applicant's cannot find any mention of speaker verification of the user. Claim 12 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 13 requires that when the speech verification fails requesting a user enter a PIN. This step is not found in the prior art. Claim 13 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 14 requires speech recognition of the voice instruction. This step is not found in the prior art. Claim 14 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 15 requires monitoring a parameter and sending a message when the parameter exceeds a defined range. After carefully reading the prior art cited by the Examiner the applicant's cannot find any mention of these steps. Claim 15 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 16 requires that when the parameter is a forceful entry signal the message is sent to the police. This is not shown in the prior art. Claim 16 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 17 requires speech synthesizing a message. This is not shown in the prior art. Claim 17 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 18 requires a voice processing and a router connected to the switch. After carefully reading the prior art cited by the Examiner the applicant's cannot find any mention of these elements. Claim 18 is allowable over the prior art.

Claim 19 requires selecting home automation features over a wireless local loop connection, voice recognition, and monitoring a forceful entry signal. After carefully reading the prior art cited by the Examiner the applicant's cannot find any mention of these steps. Claim 19 is allowable over the prior art.

Regarding the double patenting rejection, a Terminal Disclaimer is enclosed.

Prompt reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

(Bennett)

By *Dale B. Halling*
Attorney for the Applicant
Dale B. Halling
Phone: (719) 447-1990
Fax: (719) 447-0983

I hereby certify that a Reply is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on:

6/27/01
Date

Dale B. Halling
Signature(Dale B. Halling)

RECEIVED
JUL 10 2001
Technology Center 2600